

REMARKS

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hori et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,219). In response, Applicant amended claim 7 to clarify that the averaged widths of the land tracks at positions where the land identification sections are provided is narrower than the averaged width of the land tracks at positions where the groove identification sections are provided. Applicant also clarifies that the averaged width of the groove tracks at positions where the groove identification sections are provided is narrower than the averaged width of the groove tracks at positions where the land identification sections are provided, and respectfully traverses the rejection based on this amendment.

Hori is directed to a recording medium and reproducing apparatus therefor. The Examiner identifies second address information region 12 as a land identification section, and first address information region 11 as corresponding to a groove identification section. However, the averaged width of the land tracks at positions where the land identification sections are provided is not narrower than an averaged width of the land tracks at positions where the groove identification sections are provided. FIGs. 13 and 14 appear to show the averaged widths as being equal. Similarly, Hori fails to disclose or suggest an averaged width of the groove tracks at positions where the groove identification sections are provided as being narrower than an averaged width of the groove tracks at positions where the land identification sections are provided. Instead,

FIGs. 13 and 14 appear to show these averaged widths as being equal. Hori is silent regarding a feature of different averaged widths.

In contrast, as shown in FIG. 2, for example, a groove data part 22a has groove-like tracks 20a and land tracks 20b. The groove-like tracks 20a have an averaged width that is narrower than an averaged width of the groove tracks at positions where land identification sections (i.e., land data part 22b) are provided. Similarly, the averaged width of land tracks 20b at positions where the land identification sections 22b are provided is narrower than the averaged width of the land tracks 20b at positions where the groove identification sections 22a are provided. As discussed in Applicant's specification on page 7, last paragraph, since the ID for an information storage stripe is stored in the land ID section or groove ID section depending on whichever has a narrow track width, it makes it easy to identify a correspondence between the information storage stripe and the ID. Since Hori fails to disclose or suggest this averaged width feature, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

May 18, 2007
300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080
Customer No. 24978

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
By 
Joseph P. Fox
Registration No. 41,760